



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,169	02/25/2002	Jose Castillo Deniega	IFLOW.063DV1	3825
20995	7590	07/05/2006		
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			EXAMINER	
2040 MAIN STREET			LAM, ANN Y	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				
IRVINE, CA 92614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/085,169	DENIEGA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ann Y. Lam	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,11 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,11 and 12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/17/06</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampropoulos et al., 5,817,072, in view of Abiuso et al., 5,213,576, and further in view of Loeffler, 5,891,154, and Saab, 5,624,392.

Lampropoulos et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed.

As to claims 1 and 5, Lampropoulos et al. disclose an elongated tube having a plurality of exit holes increasing in size along the length of the catheter (column 7, lines 57-67), so that a fluid flowing therein will flow through substantially all of said exit holes at a substantially equal rate (column 7, lines 57-67).

However, Lampropoulos et al. do not disclose that the exit slots are normally open. (Rather, Lampropoulos et al. disclose that the exit slots are normally closed.)

However Abiuso et al. teach a catheter for delivery of medicine wherein the medicine is pressurized through holes (col. 3, lines 56-62, and see figure 4). Moreover, Abiuso et al. teach that any of holes (32, 34) in any embodiment may be replaced by slits, particularly slits having sides that close together in the absence of a pressure

differential thereacross, and Abiuso et al. disclose that such slits are intended to be included in the term "holes" (see col. 5, lines 25-29). Thus, Abiuso et al. teach that holes and slits are functional equivalents. That is, Abiuso et al. teach that holes and slits both provide the same function of permitting medicine to pass through and be applied to a patient. The fact that Abiuso et al. disclose that the term "holes" is intended to include slits emphasizes that holes and slits serve the same purpose. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the Lampropoulos et al. slits for a hole, as taught by Abiuso et al. because Abiuso et al. teach that slits and holes are functional equivalents.

However neither Lampropoulos et al. nor Abiuso et al. teach that the holes have a non-variable, combined cross-sectional flow area that is less than the flow area of the lumen of the catheter so that the holes define a flow restricting orifice of the catheter. These limitations however are taught by Loeffler in view of Saab.

Loeffler teach a catheter having irrigation ports (1, 2) on the side walls of the catheter (see col. 6, lines 35-36). Loeffler teach that the size, shape and orientation of the perfusion ports can be changed as needed (col. 6, lines 38-42.) .

Moreover, Saab teaches that by adjusting the diameter of a catheter tube, the cross-sectional area of a lumen may be varied to create different pressure gradients and fluid flow rates (col. 11, lines 50-53).

In short, Loeffler teaches that the size of the holes can be changed as needed (col. 6, lines 38-42), and Saab teaches that the diameter of a catheter tube may be adjusted to create different pressure gradients and fluid flow rates as desired (col. 11,

lines 50-53). Thus these references suggest that the holes of the Lampropoulos et al. catheter can be varied and the diameter of the catheter can be varied, both of which will alter the pressure gradients and fluid flow rates as desired. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the catheter taught by Lampropoulos et al. in view of Abiuso et al. to vary the size of the openings as taught by Loeffler because Loeffler teaches that the size of the ports can be changed as needed. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to vary the diameter of the catheter because Saab teaches adjusting the diameter of the cross-sectional area of a lumen to create different pressure gradients and fluid flow rates, as would be desirable for achieving optimum fluid delivery using the catheter. Such variations in the hole size and lumen diameter encompass a catheter having the relative total cross-sectional flow as claimed by Applicant, that is the flow area of the lumen of the catheter being greater than the combined area of the openings. Moreover, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. In this case, Lampropoulos et al. in view of Abiuso et al. teach the general conditions of the claim and the opening size and number (which together make up the combined area of the slots) being less than the cross-sectional area of the lumen of the catheter are within an optimum or workable range and thus their discovery involves only routine skill in the art. (The Office also notes that the claims do not require that all of the openings in the entire catheter be less than the cross-sectional area of the lumen. That is, the

elongated tube or infusion section claimed by Applicant may be considered only a portion of a catheter.)

As to the following claims, Lampropoulos et al. disclose the limitations as follows.

As to claim 5, since Lampropoulos et al. disclose the catheter, Lampropoulos therefore disclose providing the catheter, including the step of providing exit holes having a non-variable size. (It is noted that Applicant has not recited how the structural limitations of the catheter are provided).

As to claims 2 and 6, the holes are provided throughout the circumference of the catheter (see figure 6).

As to claims 7 and 11, the exit holes are in at least one row aligned with a longitudinal axis of the catheter (see fig. 16.)

Moreover, as to claim 3, Lampropoulos et al. does not disclose the specific diameter of the exit holes. However, the diameter of the exit holes that would achieve the optimum results, i.e., the most uniform delivery of fluids, as taught by Lampropoulos, can be discovered through routine experimentation and thus would be obvious. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

2. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampropoulos et al., 5,817,072, in view of Abiuso et al., 5,213,576,

and Loeffler, 5,891,154, and Saab, 5,624,392, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Stevens, 5,536,261.

Lampropoulos et al. in view of Abiuso et al. and Loeffler and Saab disclose the invention substantially as claimed (see above), except for the motivation to provide a closed distal end.

Stevens discloses a catheter having openings for fluid delivery in the circulatory system. Stevens teaches that the catheter has a closed distal end which encourages lateral flow as would be desirable (column 2, lines 35-37.) It would have been obvious to provide a closed end as taught by Stevens in the Lampropoulos catheter because Stevens teaches that a closed distal end provides the advantage of encouraging lateral flow as would be desirable for delivering fluid in the circulatory system.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 17, 2006 have been considered. Applicant's arguments regarding Crowley et al. are persuasive. Accordingly, the Crowley et al. reference is no longer part of the grounds for rejection, and thus Applicant's remarks regarding that reference is now moot. Applicant's other arguments however are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 5 that in a related application, the Saab reference was used. Applicant asserts that even if the Saab reference teaches that pressure and fluid flow rate may vary with the cross-sectional area of a lumen, such a teaching does not suggest a catheter having, among the other recitations, the claimed relationship

between the cross-sectional area of lumen and the combined area of the fluid exit holes. Applicant maintains that the Saab reference does not disclose that the cross-sectional area of a lumen should have any particular relationship with respect to an exit hole, or collection of exit holes, communicating with the lumen, and thus does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the Lampropoulos et al. references. These arguments are not persuasive because the Loeffler reference is relied upon by the Office to teach that the size of the holes can be changed as needed (col. 6, lines 38-42) and the Saab reference is relied upon to teach that the diameter of a catheter tube may be adjusted to create different pressure gradients and fluid flow rates as desired (col. 11, lines 50-53). Thus these references suggest that the holes of the catheter taught by Lampropoulos et al. in view of Abiuso et al. can be varied and the diameter of the catheter can be varied, both of which will alter the pressure gradients and fluid flow rates as desired. Such variations in the hole size and lumen diameter encompass a catheter having the relative total cross-sectional flow as claimed by Applicant. Also, as indicated in the above rejection, it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. In this case, the opening size and number (which together make up the combined area of the slots) being less than the cross-sectional area of the lumen of the catheter are within an optimum or workable range and thus their discovery involves only routine skill in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Y. Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-0822. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 10-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Ann Lam